



Ontario Archaeological Society

Arch Notes

New Series Volume 17, Issue 2

ISSN 0048-1742

March/April 2012



Professor's garden yields rare Hi-Lo point. See article on page 5

OAS NEWS

- 3** President's Message
- 10** Peggi Armstrong Award
- 11** Endowment Funds of the OAS

ARTICLES

- 5** A Point from Roger's Garden: A Hi-Lo Biface from Markham
- 7** Louis Bedone, 1924-2012
- 13** Archaeological Issues and News

Visit us on the Web at www.ontarioarchaeology.on.ca

Ontario Archaeological Society

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

President

Neal Ferris
519-473-1360
nferris@uwo.ca

Secretary/Treasurer

Jim Keron
519-285-2379
jrkeron@yahoo.com

Treasurer Elect

Jim Montgomery
narnia2@sympatico.ca

Vice-President

Sheryl Smith
sherylsmith222@hotmail.com

Director of Chapter Services

Chris Dalton
cdalton2420@rogers.com

Director of Heritage Advocacy

Morgan Tamplin
mtamplin@trentu.ca

Director of Membership

John Sleath
john.sleath@hotmail.com

Director of Membership Services

Alistair Jolly
alistairjolly@hotmail.com

Director of Education

Ryan Primrose
ryanprimrose@gmail.com

Director of Publications

Grant Karcich
gkarcich@durham.net

Director of Public Outreach

Megan Brooks
mebrooks@cogeco.com

Executive Director

Lorie Harris
PO Box 62066
Victoria Terrace Post Office
Toronto, Ontario M4A 2W1
Phone/fax: 416-406-5959
executive-director@ontarioarcha-

APPOINTMENTS

Editor, Ontario Archaeology

Chris Ellis
cjellis@uwo.ca

Editors, Arch Notes

Sheryl Smith (sherylsmith222@gmail.com)
Carole Stimmell (castimmell@gmail.com)

Editor, Website

Jean-Luc Pilon
jlucpilon@hotmail.com

First Nations Liaison

TBA

Symposium 2012/Windsor Liaison:

Jim Keron

Moderator – Ontario Archaeological Society

Listserve (OAS-L)

<http://tech.groups.yahoo.com/group/OAS-L/>

Vito Vaccarelli

The Ontario Archaeological Society gratefully acknowledges funding from the Ministry of Tourism and Culture through the Provincial Heritage Organization Operating Grant Program.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Welcome to another spring. Well, for the more southerly parts of the province it has been less a 'return', and more a continuing fall, slightly interspersed with occasional days of winter-like weather. Certainly for many in the CRM world, there has yet to be the winter pause in fieldwork!

Something that has kept the temperature up in recent weeks in archaeological circles has been the growing outcry of two new 'unscripted' shows in the United States: *Diggers* and *American Diggers*. These two shows (one on Spike TV and one on the National Geographic Channel) follow site looters around who dig up private property (and in some cases listed public properties) for "fun and profit."

With the Spike TV show focus being on ex-wrestler Ric Savage and his family's salvage company, the word gobsmacked doesn't begin to describe the viewer experience – and whoever would have thought we'd need to see how effective dynamite can be as a backfilling excavation technique!

Elsewhere in this issue of *Arch Notes* you will see our Advocacy Director's letter (Page 15) that joins a steady stream of criticisms of the shows coming from archaeological organizations across North America. Moreover, if you are a member of the OAS Facebook group, or any other archaeological social networking group, you will have seen an instant groundswell in social media protest, petitions and the like over the last few weeks.

The sensibilities celebrated in these shows, and the damage they potentially can do in encouraging others, necessarily required this response from opposing viewpoints in archaeology. So hats off to the community in North America, and beyond, for doing so.

But as that Cultural Heritage contrarian, Thomas King, noted in a recent post on the World Archaeological Congress discussion group, archaeological condemnation of

such actions needs to be more than a simple "how dare anyone but us pull stuff from the ground" outrage. After all, the moral high-ground implied in such outrage may be more lump than mountain, some days. It doesn't take much to acknowledge examples we are all familiar with in past academic work, CRM, or avocational investigations of instances where it would be hard to argue the result was anything other than loss and destruction, or harvesting solely for a capital gain for the individuals doing the harvesting.

True, the folks in those TV shows are quite gleeful and upfront about their venal desire for "fun and profit," while we, collectively, tend to cite the nobler-sounding mandate of preserving or documenting the past. But if we are to do more than 'talk the talk', we need to recognize that, beyond our community, we may at times only appear a shade or two of grey different than the people in those TV shows.

So beyond the condemnation of glorifying looting as a commercial free-for-all, it seems these incidents also invite the archaeological community to reflect on how we, in practice, really need to be an entirely different colour spectrum of material past handlers, rather than a shade paler. That certainly is the promise we are ready to articulate as needed, and the expectation of those outside practice who are willing to extend to us their faith when they assume archaeology lives up to that intent. It is essential that we make the ethical promises we espouse to in our societies, associations, registrars, and various other organisations something that does inform and shape day to day decisions of practice, even when it is difficult or costly to do so. And if others might not be so willing to extend their faith to archaeology, or need to be convinced that distinctions between types of 'diggers' are more than kettles and pots, simply dismissing such concerns as incorrect or unformed is meaningless.

Working regularly, collaboratively and even in the service of those beyond

archaeology who draw more than an economic value and meaning from that heritage, even if at times it can be uncomfortable, inconvenient, and even personally challenging, makes practice less about personal preserves, and more about building from the commonalities of understanding and interpreting the past, even if archaeologists see and come to know that past in a way that is very different than how others do.

Working to live up to those ethical commitments we believe are important to defining what it is we think we do, is something we all try to do. But doing so even when it hurts, costs, and pushes us out of personal comfort zone is what makes archaeological practice, and the archaeological heritage we document, rise from a different genetic pool than *Diggers*. And from my perspective, in the smackdown that can be contested heritage values, I know personally I would rather not be tag-teamed with *American Diggers* against other heritage interests!

On other fronts you will see in this issue a notice of the OAS conference. Planned for November 9-11, for the first time the conference will be held in the city of Windsor. I hope you'll consider participating in the conference. There is still time to submit paper proposals, or even propose an additional session, if you think you have something that is a perfect fit for the conference. And here's hoping our friends from right across the border are present in large numbers, giving everyone many opportunities to renew acquaintances and make new friends!

As well, the OAS will need to work towards renewing our Strategic Plan this year. We hope to have a questionnaire set up for members in the next couple of months to help identify priorities for the Society over the next few years – a feedback that can help inform a draft Strategic Plan we discuss and finalize during the Windsor meeting this November.

Stay tuned to Arch Notes for more details.

The Archaeology of the Great Lakes Area

The Annual Symposium of the
Ontario Archaeological Society

November 9 - 11, 2012

**Holiday Inn Suites Ambassador Bridge
Windsor, Ontario**

Call for Proposals

Concurrent Sessions on Saturday, November 10th

Please submit your proposals by May 31, 2012 to Session Chairs.

| Session | Chair | Email |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|
| <i>War of 1812</i> | Dena Doroszenko | Dena.Doroszenko@heritagetrust.on.ca |
| <i>Palaeo & Archae</i> | Chris Ellis | cjellis@uwo.ca |
| <i>Woodland</i> | Peter Timmins | ptimmins@uwo.ca |
| <i>Western Basin</i> | Christopher Watts Lindsay Foreman | christopher.watts@utoronto.ca ljforema@gmail.ca |

*Please note due to time constraints not all proposals will necessarily be accepted.



Visit us on-line for more details and registration.

<http://www.ontarioarchaeology.on.ca/>



A POINT FROM ROGER'S GARDEN: A HI-LO BIFACE FROM MARKHAM



Figure 1: The find site of a Hi-Lo projectile point

by **Jeffrey Bursey**

Near the end of June, while the Anthropology Department at the University of Toronto at Mississauga was frantically preparing to move from its long-time 'digs' in the North Building, Professor Heather Miller brought in a projectile point for identification. Her husband, Professor Roger Lohmann, had recovered this artifact while digging in his garden in Markham. The projectile point was identifiable as a particularly well-made example of a Hi-Lo point manufactured from Haldimand chert. Considering the rarity of Late Paleoindian sites east of Toronto, both the location of the site and some attributes of the artifact might be of value for unraveling early hunter-gatherer lithic reduction strategies used for exploiting the northwest shore of Lake Ontario.

Site Location

The projectile point was recovered less than 1 km southeast of the intersection of Highway 7 and Markham Road in Markham. More specifically the site is on the north side of the valley of a small tributary that flows into the Rouge River

valley about 500 m to the south. This location has a south facing exposure and is relatively well drained.

While this kind of location is consistent with Hi-Lo occupation sites (Deller 1976, 1979), it is also possible that this was simply an isolated projectile point, perhaps lost in an attempt to kill a game animal from above.

Dr. Lohmann reported finding the biface in the top of the clay subsoil while preparing his garden (Figure 1). Although topsoil had been introduced over time and other modifications to the landscape had accompanied and followed development, the artifact was embedded at the top of the clay and was in situ at the time of discovery. With minimal exposure of the clay surface, it would be impossible to determine whether more artifacts are present without further excavations.

Description of the Biface

The Hi-Lo point was manufactured from a blue-grey variant of Haldimand chert from the lower Devonian Bois Blanc formation that, in poor light, is nearly identical to some variants of Onondaga chert and close examination was necessary to be sure of the raw material identification.

While this variant of Haldimand chert is not as commonly

noted in Hi-Lo assemblages, the whitish version being preferred (Ellis 2004:59-61), some specimens have been observed in assemblages like that recovered from the Murray 2 site (Burse 1998).

During a visit to the Cayuga quarry after the Anderson site excavation (Burse 1996), strata of Haldimand chert were observed where the white variant dominated but lenses of the blue-grey and a translucent greenish version sometimes referred to as the Port Colbourne variety (Fox 1979; 2009:361), were in very close proximity. In fact, some of the flake arises on this biface appear to include the Port Colbourne variant. If this observation can be supported then it might also be possible to infer that the biface was manufactured from a preform that was oriented relatively flat or horizontally in relation to the geological stratum.

Therefore, while the white versions of Haldimand chert appear to be preferred, although perhaps only because the white version is more common at quarry sites, the other variants were also exploited at times.

In most attributes, this projectile point appears to be a fairly typical example of the Side-Notched version of Hi-Lo projectile points, which Ellis (2004:64) argues is late in the sequence, possibly belonging in the Early Archaic (see also Ellis and Deller 2002; Ellis, Timmins and Martelle 2009:791-792). The total length of the projectile point is 42.4 mm of which 32.6 mm is blade length and the remaining 9.8 mm is the length of the hafting element. The maximum blade width is 31.8 mm, the inter-notch width is 21.8 mm and the basal width is 21.2 mm due in part to asymmetrical flaking on the right ear. The notch on the dorsal left side measures 10 mm long and 3 mm deep. There is a basal concavity of 4 mm made by short (2-3 mm) retouch flaking. Basal thinning flake scars, detached earlier than the flaking to produce the basal concavity, do not extend beyond the notches. There has been light to moderate grinding along the base with the heaviest grinding in the notch but otherwise the blade edges are still sharp.

One of the most interesting attributes of the projectile point includes what appear to be remnants of the original preform or

blank that indicates how the biface was manufactured. The dorsal face (Figure 2) was shaped by the detachment of long and thin invasive flakes that routinely crossed the midline of the biface leaving no central ridge. There is a distinct bevel on the dorsal right lateral edge that extends up to 8 mm from the lateral edge, produced by the detachment of fine flakes. While many Hi-Lo projectile points exhibit a similar kind of bevel from retouch so as to create a scraper-like secondary use, in this case the retouch facet appears to have been to thin and shape the biface since the maximum thickness (9.5 mm) of the blade is near the tip and this retouch facet. The ventral face is relatively flat but retains two flake scars that appear to have been from the original flake. This face, then, was modified by the detachment of relatively long thin flakes.

Overall, the biface appears to have been carefully flaked to produce a streamlined surface. Arises between flake scars are of minimal height. The presence of very few short (<5 mm) flake detachments along the lateral



Figure 2

blade edges suggests that little to no retouch of the edges was performed before the biface was lost or discarded. This projectile point, therefore, has the appearance of having been directly manufactured from a large flake of Haldimand chert that was shaped by the detachment of long, thin invasive flakes but does not appear to have been retouched or resharpened.

Two inferences can be generated from the above description of the biface. First, while not conclusive, it appears that the projectile point was directly manufactured from a large flake, not through serial biface reduction. Secondly, the flake scars on both faces of the projectile point would have been produced through the detachment of flakes too narrow and thin to have served as flake tools. While this flake scar pattern is not unique, in my experience it is relatively less common than Hi-Lo bifaces, including projectile points, covered with flake scars produced through the detachment of larger, wider and thicker flakes that could have served as flake tools. Hi-Lo bifaces are commonly noted to exhibit alternate uses as drills, scrapers, etc. (e.g., Ellis, Timmins and Martelle 2009:791-792) and I suspect that some were also used as cores for the detachment of small flakes that could be used as expedient tools. Similarly, bifaces of various sizes and degrees of refinement have also been cited as possible bifacial cores (Bursey 1998; Ellis and Deller 2002). This does not appear to have been the case here so it appears that, instead, this biface represents a relatively pristine example that entered the archaeological record with considerable remaining utility.

Conclusions

The distribution of Late Paleoindian (or Early Archaic following Ellis and Deller (2002) and Ellis, Timmins and Martelle (2009)) Hi-Lo occupations has been well established in southwest Ontario and the distribution has been extended east across the north shore of Lake Ontario to east of the Rice Lake area (Jackson 2004). Unfortunately, with the exception of a brief description of the ENL Hi-Lo site (Roberts 1985:211-212), virtually all the published information available is from seemingly isolated projectile point finds. While the lack of reported occupation sites is most likely to be a function of decisions concerning significance and archaeological visibility, we can derive some insight from the available data.

The location of Late Paleoindian finds along the north shore of Lake Ontario do indicate an orientation towards inland hunting, probably of relatively larger ungulates. So far, however, there is no evidence of the hunting of herds and it is more likely the focus was on single animals. While it is possible that larger kill and processing sites may yet be found or are inundated by the higher waters of Lake Ontario, until such evidence is found the safer inference is that solitary game animals were the focus of the hunt.

The stone tool technology appears to have been oriented towards providing a reliable tool kit that could be used to meet contingencies as they arose. Hi-Lo bifaces were frequently used for functions other than as projectile points and possibly also as

cores. This particular artifact, however, does not appear to have been used for other functions and may not have even been used at all since there is no evidence of impact damage to the tip. It may literally have been an accidental loss.

To me, however, ultimately the most interesting attribute of this biface is the overall flaking pattern. The fine refinement of the faces by the detachment of long but thin and narrow flakes is not an attribute I have observed before on Hi-Lo bifaces. It is instead similar in many ways to what I was able to observe in some Early Archaic Kirk Corner-notched (i.e., Netting) bifaces and projectile points (Bursey 2008). In the assemblages from the latter technological horizon, the flaking pattern was also used to produce flakes for flake tools as well as thin the biface. This lithic reduction strategy not only produced flakes that were highly predictable in shape but resulted in a relatively thin and even biface that could also be retouched as needed with relatively little skill or risk. The biface from Roger's garden conforms to this overall pattern. It is thickest near the tip and thins towards the base. The fine flaking pattern gave it relatively smooth surfaces, which would have given it both improved penetrability and ease of retouch as needed.

I therefore argue that this flaking pattern raises the possibility that there is either continuity between late Hi-Lo and the Early Archaic, Kirk Corner-notched technological horizons or some form of interaction between populations using these lithic reduction strategies. Obviously a single projectile point provides minimal evidence in support of this kind of inference and a complete, detailed analysis of several, well-dated assemblages would be necessary to make such a claim. Furthermore, while Hi-Lo appears to have been development from the fluted point horizon, the Kirk Corner-notched projectile point style is broadly distributed throughout the entirety of eastern North America. Nonetheless, it may therefore not be a coincidence that the side-notched variety of the Hi-Lo point style has been argued to be the latest and that some Kirk Corner-notched projectile point sites used both Haldimand and Onondaga chert (see ASI 1992, 1994; Bursey 2008; Dodd 1997) adds to the possibility the two horizons either evolved from one to the other or interacted somehow.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Dr. Heather Miller, Department of Anthropology at the University of Toronto at Mississauga, brought the Hi-Lo point to my attention that her husband, Dr. Roger Lohmann, Department of Anthropology at Trent University, recovered from his garden. The photos of the garden and the point were also taken by Roger and sent to me. Bill Fox provided a second opinion on the raw material based on the photos and Andrew Murray reminded me of details about his two points from a bit further to the west. Obviously since I decided to say a lot more about this one projectile point than the vast majority seem to warrant, any errors, omissions or over extensions are solely my responsibility.

REFERENCES

- (ASI) Archaeological Services Incorporated
 1992 An Archaeological Assessment of Proposed Wellingdale Subdivision 21T-88055 Part of Lots 11, 12 and 13, Concession 4, E.H.S. City of Brampton, Regional Municipality of Peel. Unpublished licence report on file at the Ministry of Citizenship, Culture and Recreation, Toronto, Ont.
- 1994 Stage 3 Assessment of Sites AkGw-57 (Wellingdale), AkGw-58, and AkGw-60 Subdivision 21T-88055 Part of Lots 11, 12 and 13, Concession 4, E.H.S. City of Brampton, Regional Municipality of Peel. Unpublished licence report on file at the Ministry of Citizenship, Culture and Recreation, Toronto, Ont.
- Burse, J. A.
 1996 The Anderson Site (AfGx-54) and the Early and Middle Ontario Iroquoian Occupations of the Lower Grand River. *Kewa* 96-7:2-20.
- 1998 Surface Collected Artifacts from the Murray 2 Site (AfGx-72), A Hi-Lo Component Near Cayuga, Ontario. *Kewa* 98-6:2-10.
- 2008 *Early Archaic/Early Holocene Lithic Technology in Southcentral Ontario, Canada*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of Toronto.
- Deller, D. B.
 1976 Paleo-Indian Locations on Late Pleistocene Shorelines, Middlesex County, Ontario. *Ontario Archaeology* 26:3-19.
- 1979 Paleo-Indian Reconnaissance in the Counties of Lambton and Middlesex, Ontario. *Ontario Archaeology* 32:3-20.
- Dodd, C. F.
 1997 The Trail Site: A Netting Camp on the Grand River. In *Pre-ceramic Southern Ontario*, edited by P. J. Woodley and P. G. Ramsden, pp. 65-75. *Occasional Papers in Northeastern Archaeology* No. 9. Copetown Press, Hamilton.
- Ellis, C. J.
 2004 Hi-Lo: An Early Lithic Complex in the Great Lakes Region. In *The Late Paleo-Indian Great Lakes: Geological and Archaeological Investigations of Late Pleistocene and Early Holocene Environments*, edited by L. J. Jackson and A. Hinshelwood, pp. 57-83. Mercury Series, Archaeology Paper 165. Canadian Museum of Civilization, Gatineau.
- Ellis, C. J., and D. B. Deller
 2002 Excavations at the Caradoc Site (AfHj-104): A Late Paleo-Indian Ritual Artifact Deposit. *Occasional Publications of the London Chapter*, OAS No. 8, London.
- Ellis, C. J., P. A. Timmins and H. Martelle
 2009 At the Crossroads and Periphery: The Archaic Archaeological Record of Southern Ontario. In *Archaic Societies: Diversity and Complexity across the Midcontinent*, edited by T. E. Emerson, D. L. McElrath and A. C. Fortier, pp. 787-837. SUNY Press, Albany.
- Fox, W. A.
 Southern Ontario Chert Sources. Unpublished Paper presented at the 11th Annual meeting of the Canadian Archaeological Association, Quebec City, Quebec.
- 2009 Ontario Cherts Revisited. In *Painting the Past with a Broad Brush: Papers in Honour of James Valliere Wright*, edited by D. L. Keenlyside and J.-L. Pilon, pp. 353-369. Mercury Series Archaeological Paper 170. National Museum of Civilization, Gatineau.
- Jackson, L. J.
 2004 Changing our Views of late Palaeo-Indian in Southern Ontario. In *The Late Paleo-Indian Great Lakes: Geological and Archaeological Investigations of Late Pleistocene and Early Holocene Environments*, edited by L. J. Jackson and A. Hinshelwood, pp. 25-56. Mercury Series, Archaeology Paper 165. Canadian Museum of Civilization, Gatineau.
- Murray, A.
 2005 Hi-Lo Points in Pickering. *Arch Notes* N.S. 10(4):9.
- Roberts, A. C. B.
 1985 *Pre-ceramic Occupations Along the North Shore of Lake Ontario*. Mercury Series, Archaeological Survey of Canada, Paper No. 132. National Museum of Canada, Ottawa.

LOUIS BADONE

1924-2012

by Charles Garrad

The funeral was held Feb. 24, 2012, for long-term OAS member Louis Badone. Louis and Donalda held a Family Membership in the OAS for decades. They also belong to the Ontario Historical Society, and Louis served as President of the North York Historical Society.

During the time I operated the OAS Office at 126 Willowdale Ave., they lived close enough that I hand-delivered their *Ontario Archaeology* and *Arch-Notes* to their home, and so I got to know them. Neither Louis nor Donalda ever held office in the OAS but their contributions to heritage, and particularly heritage conservation and the written and photographic record, excel.

When Donalda researched the history of their house on Avondale Avenue, she discovered it had a fascinating history, having previously stood on Yonge Street in pioneer days and later moved up the farm lane, which later evolved into Avondale Avenue, and bricked up. This became the subject of Donalda's first book to which Louis contributed characteristically as a quiet collaborative supporter. He also provided photographs to accompany Donalda's texts for this and Donalda's subsequent books.

The second book drew on their experiences as members of the OAS and the Toronto Board of Education's Archaeological Resource Centre and reported work by many well-known archaeologists across Canada, beginning with our own Dr. Mima Kapches. The OAS was listed in the Acknowledgements "especially Ellen Blaubergs and Charles Garrad". The book was 'launched' and sold at the OAS Symposium of 1992, enthusiastically reviewed by Christine Caroppo in *Arch Notes* (93-1:7). OAS Secretary Ellen Blaubergs submitted it to the Canadian Archaeological Society for consideration for its 1992 Public Writing Award, Professional/Institutional Category, which it won.

Another unique project by the Badones had unexpected consequences for the ROM. In 1972 they purchased a century-old log house on a farm near Lakefield which they restored, and there operated a Highland cattle farm. When the ROM wanted hides to clothe their replica mammoth, Louis was able to arrange this through one of his Highland cattle associates.

Louis and Donalda campaigned successfully to have their historic house preserved when Avondale Avenue was redeveloped. On May 1, 2004, the local community gathered to witness the removal of the house a short distance. In 2011 Louis and Donalda both received Volunteer Service Awards for 40 years work with the North York Historical Society.

As a professional engineer in metallurgy, Louis held a number of positions, including with the Avro Arrow until its cancellation in 1959, the Department of Mines in Ottawa, and Quality Control Manager with Chrysler. Following retirement Louis volunteered with the Canadian Executive Services Overseas, and conducted projects in China, Peru, Senegal and Costa Rica.

He passed quietly after a busy and active life of service. Our condolences go to Donalda and family. Louis and Donalda's daughter, Dr. Ellen Badone, is a Professor and Graduate Director with the Department of Anthropology and Department of Religious Studies at McMaster University, Hamilton.

Books written by Donalda Badone to which Louis contributed support, companionship and technical expertise:

1988 *The Complete House Detective: An Ontario House and its history* Boston Mills Press

1992 *Time Detectives: Clues from our Past* Annick Press
1990 (second edition)

2003 *Dundurn Castle* Boston Mills Press

CONGRATULATIONS

Neal Trubowitz will mark 40 years of membership with the OAS in 2012. Congratulations to Neal for his long-time support of the organization and its aims.

Neal lives in Andover, Massachusetts.

THE PEGGI ARMSTRONG PUBLIC ARCHAEOLOGY AWARD

If you, as an OAS member, know of a person, group or institution that is a potential candidate for this award, for details read below, or check the Ottawa Chapter website (www.ottawaoas.ca). The Peggi Armstrong Public Archaeology Award was launched in 1996 and was named in memory of Peggi Armstrong (1957-1997). Her commitment and creative enthusiasm was a driving force behind the development of a continuing public archaeology component in the activities of the Ottawa Chapter OAS. This is an OAS Inc. award administered through the Ottawa Chapter.

Public Archaeology for the purpose of the award stimulates public interest in the study of archaeology, promotes awareness of cultural resources and heritage preservation, and fosters individual and collective efforts to advance the ethical practice of archaeology.

Nominations are examined under four criteria:

- Scope of the audience which the nominee has reached through the use of displays, demonstrations, workshops, training in excavation techniques, site tours, or the development of educational programmes and materials.
- Innovation in the design and delivery of such activities and nature of public involvement.

- Development of enduring public archaeology resource materials
- Scope of events, partnerships or sponsorships brought together to promote public archaeology.

Nominees must have contributed significantly to promoting archaeology of and in Ontario, by means of public archaeology. If a professional, the nominee must have demonstrated commitment to public archaeology over and above his or her normal job description. The nominator should endeavour to address the nominee's contribution to public archaeology under each of the pertinent award criteria listed above. Wherever possible, supplementary materials should be included in support of the nomination, such as letters of reference from other individuals, and information on institutions such as brochures or descriptive hand-outs or web-site material about programs.

Send your nomination by August 1 to PAPA Selection Committee via contact@ottawaoas.ca or c/o Ottawa Chapter, Ontario Archaeological Society, P.O. Box 4939, Station E, Ottawa K1S 5J1. There can be more than one award in any given year, so don't hesitate.

RE-EXPERIENCE THE WAR OF 1812 IN BARRIE

Just wanted to give everyone an update on the War of 1812 event and activities planned for June 1, 2 and 3 regarding the Nine Mile Portage and the City of Barrie's connection to the War of 1812.

Plans are coming along very well and we have had many re-enactors, participants, performers and entertainers sign on for the event to date. We are still looking to book more re-enactors, participants and entertainers especially any naval groups with period vessels that would like to attend and be part of the large naval contingent that will be on the water at this event. We are also looking for any Fife & Drum groups that may be interested in attending. We will also have space for historical displays and exhibits so if there are historical associations, historic sites or museums that would like to have a display or exhibit at the event please let me know.

Friday June 1 – Education Day:

Time – 10:00am to 8:00pm – Heritage
March/April 2012

Park/Memorial Square. Encampment, Re-enactments, Activities, Displays and Live Entertainment

Opening Ceremonies & Reception are from 6:30pm to 8:00pm in Heritage Park. A cannon will be fired to signify the opening of the event!

There will be an Appreciation and Hospitality Reception for re-enactors and participants from 9:30pm to 11:30pm in Heritage Park

Saturday June 2:

Time – 10:00am to 8:00pm – Heritage Park/Memorial Square. Encampment, Re-enactments, Activities, Displays and Live Entertainment

Freedom of the City Parade from 11:00am to 1:00pm at City Hall. Over 1,000 modern soldiers and personal from CFB Borden will be participating. Re-enactors will be marching with the troops.

Prince Charles and Camilla have been invited to participate but have not confirmed to date.

Pillaging of Downtown Merchants from

2:00pm to 4:00pm. Americans will invade the Downtown Core and Pillage Participating Merchants

Fireworks are planned to start from 9pm to 9:15pm.

Re-enactors & Participants Appreciation and Hospitality Reception will run from 10:00pm to 11:30pm at Heritage Park

Sunday June 3:

Time – 10:00am to 3:00pm – Heritage Park/Memorial Square. Encampment, Re-enactments, Activities, Displays and Live Entertainment

Sail Past and Salute from 1 to 3 p.m. at Heritage Park followed by official rum toast. Sail Past to involve replica vessels and tall ships.

FOR MORE INFO:

contact David J. Brunelle (davidbrunelle@rogers.com; 705-716-7124; 23 Byrnes Crescent, Penetanguishene, Ontario, Canada, L9M 1W4).

Arch Notes 17 (2)

THE ENDOWMENT FUNDS OF THE ONTARIO ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

by **Jim Ke ron – Treasurer
OAS**

The OAS has four endowment funds which can only be used for the specific purposes identified for each fund. This is a report to the membership on the values of these funds at the end of fiscal 2011 and includes some general commentary on the balances of the various funds.

The four funds are as follows.

1. The Valerie Sonstenes Student Research Fund
2. The Ontario Archaeology Publication Fund
3. The Awards Fund
4. The Future Fund

The value of any specific fund at the end of the year is determined by the value at the beginning of the year plus any donations made during the year, plus the change in the value of the overall investment fund (could be negative), plus any surpluses (or deficits) allocated to the fund minus any direct cost allocations to the fund. These factors are all specifically identified for each fund in the standard reporting format below. The values for 2011 have not been audited yet and could change slightly.

Member donations are one critical contributor to the fund and members are free to select whichever fund to which they would like to contribute.

Valerie Sonstenes Student Research Fund

The Valerie Sonstenes Student Research Fund is a restricted fund intended to support graduate student research that relates to and advances knowledge on Ontario's archaeological record. The interest of this fund will provide students with small grants to assist them in undertaking research for Masters, PhD or postdoctoral level

projects.

Funding will be directed to support costs directly related to obtaining data for research that otherwise could not be paid for. This could include paying for specialist studies (e.g., faunal, floral, radiocarbon, geo-physical, etc.), travel and accommodation to visit archives, collections holdings, interview participants, or costs other than those related to direct site excavations.

Upon completion, recipients will also be required to provide the OAS with a copy of the results of their research, including either a project summary to be published in *Arch Notes*, or a scholarly article published in *Ontario Archaeology*.

This fund was established in 2011 and was seeded with a \$10,000 bequest from the estate of Valerie Sonstenes, an OAS member who unfortunately passed away in April of 2010. The fund value was 10,340 at the end of 2011 and we have since received over \$1,800 in donations in 2012. The fund is small enough at this point in time that many more donations will be required before it can be expected to fulfill its promise. The OAS would encourage members to donate to this fund or perhaps even remember it in your will.

Ontario Archaeology Publication Fund

This fund is dedicated to provide long term income for the publication of at least one issue per year of the journal *Ontario Archaeology* each year. This fund was originally seeded by a major grant in the amount of \$60,000 provided by the Government of Ontario approximately 20 years ago. It is a 'restricted fund' which means that, money from this account can only be used to publish and distribute the journal.

At the end of 2011 the value of this

fund was \$157,892 which is more money than we reasonably need to accomplish this goal. This value is such that even with no further subscription income we could keep publishing *OA* for another 30 years. Another way of looking at this is that with today's cost structure, if our investment never earned another dime, we could publish *OA* for over 150 years. The point here is that the *OA* Publication fund is extremely healthy and guarantees the publication of *OA* beyond the lifetime of even our youngest student members.

The Awards Fund

The purpose of this fund is to provide income for the awards program administered by the Society, and consists of an amount set aside by the Society for this purpose, donations and accumulated investment earnings. This fund is not restricted.

The value of the fund was \$4,013 at the end of 2011 which leaves it in a strong position.

The OAS Future Fund

The purpose of this fund is to assist in supporting the administrative expenses of the Society in the future. Included in the fund are accumulated Life Membership fees, donations and accumulated investment earnings. (AN 95-4: 8). This fund was established at the ABM in October 1989. The minutes of that meeting record a motion that the society establish an endowment fund to provide for the long term finances of the OAS. The Life member money should be included and members should be able to make donations to the fund. (AN 90-5).

Besides donations and investment gains, at the end of a given fiscal year any surplus in Administration expenses is added to the Future fund but if we

run a deficit in administration the deficit becomes a draw on the Future Fund.

Administration expenses includes the costs of running the office, the symposium, salary of staff, and the costs of printing and distributing *Arch Notes*, membership fees and the PHO grant but also includes sales and symposium profits amongst others. Or

more simply stated everything except the *Ontario Archaeology* journal and awards.

A major challenge to the Executive Board is balancing Administration Expenses.

At the end of 2011, the value of the Future Fund was \$88,863 which puts us in a very strong position here. The biggest financial risk to the society is

the continuance of the PHO grant given pressure on the provincial government to rein in spending. This grant provides funds which cover the Executive Directors salary and office space.

Even if this funding was cut off we could continue to employ the Executive Director for a full two years after the cut off.

| ENDOWMENT FUND PERFORMANCE | Actual | | YTD |
|---------------------------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| | 2,009 | 2,010 | 2,011 |
| Valerie Sonstenes Student Scholarship Fund | | | |
| Value at Start of Year | | | n/a |
| Investment Fund Gain/(Loss) | | | - |
| Bequest | | | 10,000 |
| Donations | | | 340 |
| Withdrawals | | | - |
| Final Value | n/a | n/a | 10,340 |
| Ontario Archaeology Publication Fund | | | |
| Value at Start of Year | 126,156 | 142,193 | 159,692 |
| Investment Fund Gain/(Loss) | 15,989 | 12,529 | 3,743 |
| Donations | 686 | 723 | 469 |
| OA Surplus (Deficit) | (639) | 4,247 | (6,013) |
| Final Value | 142,193 | 159,692 | 157,892 |
| Awards Fund | | | |
| Value at Start of Year | 3,158 | 3,609 | 3,602 |
| Investment Fund Gain/(Loss) | 400 | 318 | 84 |
| Donations | 50 | 138 | 327 |
| Withdrawals | - | (463) | - |
| Final Value | 3,609 | 3,602 | 4,013 |
| Future Fund | | | |
| Value at Start of Year | 72,081 | 78,114 | 83,361 |
| Life membership Purchased | | 750 | |
| Investment Fund Gain/(Loss) | 11,439 | 4,899 | 1,954 |
| Donations | 3,086 | 1,939 | 1,972 |
| Operating Surplus (Deficit) on the year | (8,493) | (2,341) | 1,576 |
| Final Value | 78,114 | 83,361 | 88,863 |

ARCHAEOLOGICAL ISSUES AND NEWS

WHAT DO WE STAND TO LOSE?

by **Krissy Nickle, Vice President, Save Ontario Shipwrecks**

In mid-November of 2011, the Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport eliminated the role of Marine Heritage Advisor. The Ministry searched for over a year to find a qualified candidate to provide specialist technical consulting advice, expertise and training on marine archaeology, archaeological resource conservation, protection and management, to provincial marine heritage organizations, other ministries/ governments, divers and other key stakeholders. They only managed to fill the position in late 2009; now, almost exactly two years later, the role is being eliminated.

As the Vice President of Save Ontario Shipwrecks (one of the 'provincial marine heritage organizations' mentioned above) I am devastated by the loss of a provincial Marine Heritage Advisor. Not just the loss of the position itself, but the potential short- and long-term ramifications of having no one in the Provincial Government qualified to assess and protect our marine heritage resources.

Ontario has significant marine heritage resources. One sixth of our province is covered by lakes and rivers, most of which have, at some point, been conduits of travel, trade and settlement. The cold, fresh water in Ontario's lakes and rivers make them an ideal environment for archaeological preservation: staggering examples of preservation on a scale not seen anywhere else in the world. These waters contain, among other things:

- Perfectly preserved ships that sank in battles, or because of accidents or natural disasters. These ships are time capsules which often contain artefacts that reveal the cultural context of the ship and the

story of her last moments;

- The remains of fish-traps and weirs, campsites and settlements that make up a record of the earliest First Nations peoples who travelled, traded and lived along Ontario's waterways;

- Submerged docks, locks, and even entire towns that tell the story of settlement, trade, and industry in this province.

The argument has been made that the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport still employs a staff of archaeologists and heritage professionals, so why does this one position matter. Marine archaeology is a highly specialized discipline with experienced and knowledgeable professionals in short supply all around the world. The Province of Ontario has a duty to protect and preserve its fragile underwater cultural resources. And up to this point, I've been proud of the Ministry's Cultural Services Unit for their inclusion of a Marine Heritage Advisor. The Province has even legislated the protection of three of our most important shipwrecks: the Edmund Fitzgerald in Lake Superior, and the Hamilton and the Scourge in Lake Ontario. But this legislation has little practical value if the Province has no means to back it up. Yes, provincial law enforcement can prevent people from diving on these wrecks, and can guard against theft and vandalism of all our underwater heritage resources. From a legal standpoint, very little will change, except that the Province will no longer have an expert on hand to assist our police and attorneys in their efforts to uphold the law.

Theft or vandalism is one thing: these acts are against the law, and can be dealt with as such. Without a Provincial Marine Heritage Advisor, our submerged heritage sites face a much greater threat: completely legal destruction. Many sites, especially those along shorelines, lay in the path of proposed construction and development projects. One of the key responsibilities stated in the job

specifications of the Marine Heritage Advisor is to provide "critical review and comment on archaeological assessment and mitigation studies, and development proposals that may impact archaeological resources" and to ensure "that submerged cultural resources are not adversely impacted by development." With no one qualified to judge the quality of underwater archaeological assessments, clearance may be given for development of a site to proceed without a full understanding of the implications to our marine heritage. And once a 5000 year old First Nations settlement is dredged from the riverbed, or a commercial dock piling is driven through a War of 1812 shipwreck, the damage is done: a unique and priceless remnant of history, along with the knowledge it could have provided, is lost and can never be recovered. Protection of Ontario's marine heritage is not just about historical knowledge, or the physical aspects of the sites themselves, which – whatever their intrinsic value – could be viewed as priceless.

Our marine heritage sites, specifically our shipwrecks, have real value to our economy: they are the key to a thriving sector of business in this province. There is an entire tourism industry in Ontario that operates surrounding marine heritage resources – including almost 200 small businesses ranging from dive shops to charter vessels. There are over 200,000 SCUBA divers in Ontario alone, not to mention neighbouring provinces as well as visiting divers from the United States where laws and attitudes concerning the removal of artefacts from wreck sites are much different. 17% of American and Canadian SCUBA divers travel to Ontario to dive. Among North American divers our province is rated second only to British Columbia as the most appealing place to travel in Canada. And let's face it: we're not the Caribbean. We don't have coral reefs or bright, tropical fish. Divers aren't coming to Ontario to see zebra mussels

and lake trout: they are coming here to see some of the best preserved shipwrecks in the entire world. If Ontario's wrecks are not monitored and protected, then Ontario's divers – and the dive tourists from around the world – will go elsewhere to dive. And with them will go substantial tourism dollars. A study carried out in 2006 to assess the possible financial benefits of encouraging a dive industry in shoreline communities along Lake Huron suggested that over one dive season, anywhere between 1 and 3 million dollars could be generated into the local economy. An earlier study on the economic impact of tourism noted that for every \$1 of tourism expenditure generated in a community, a further \$7 is expended in that community indirectly (for example, expenditures by businesses that cater to tourists, as well as expenditures by the employees of those companies). Assuming these statistics still hold true, that would bring the total up to 8-24 million dollars generated by SCUBA diving tourism in one community over one season. These figures are just dollars and cents, and don't even touch on the existing jobs and new employment opportunities that are the result of a thriving dive community.

The elimination of the Marine Heritage Advisor position puts at risk the greater Ontario SCUBA community which depends to a significant degree on the preservation of shipwrecks to attract present and future divers. Save Ontario Shipwrecks is a group dedicated to the protection of Ontario's marine heritage, but we aren't the only ones who think that Ontario NEEDS a Marine Heritage Advisor. OPSEU, heritage groups, dive groups, archaeologists, knowledgeable professionals and concerned citizens have all expressed alarm over the elimination of this position. Our concerns have been met with polite indifference. But this issue affects all Ontarians, so I'm asking all Ontarians to make their voices heard. Go online and sign our petition at www.change.org/groups/sos; ask questions of your local MPPs; at the very least, help spread the word. The Ministry

of Tourism, Culture and Sport needs to live up to its name: the loss of Ontario's Marine Heritage Advisor threatens Ontario tourism. It threatens Ontario culture. It threatens Ontario sport. For Ontario's sake, I hope it's not too late.

Renewed Action Plan for Arts, Heritage and Culture in Ottawa (2013-2018)

February 8 2012 was a significant date for archaeological heritage in Ottawa. On this date the Renewed Action Plan for Arts, Heritage and Culture in Ottawa (2013-2018) was passed, after members of the archaeological community for several years had attended meetings, consultations, interviews, representations, etc. We can be grateful to the energies and persistence of the City of Ottawa Steering Committee on Heritage and Culture who made the case for including archaeology to the mayor and councillors.

Filling in the details of the plan will entail more in-put from OAS and other groups such as Aboriginal representatives and the NCC, but archaeology is now officially recognized as a responsibility of our far flung municipality. Ottawa's area is the largest of any municipality in Canada, so lots of potential.

Below, from a fairly complex document, is the part directly pertaining to archaeology from the Recommended Strategies and Actions.

II. PRESERVE AND DEVELOP CULTURAL AND CREATIVE PLACES AND SPACES

Places and spaces matter. Great places and spaces matter more. Located in the great Ottawa Valley, Ottawa lies on the banks of the Ottawa River and has the mouths of the Rideau River and Canal within its hold. Ottawa's remarkable natural environment initiates its identity. Archaeology, natural and cultural heritage, cultural facility development, creative clusters and cultural districts, public art, architecture and urban design are all about place-

making.

Place-making makes good economic sense, and smart cities develop communities in which people want to live, work and play. Creative talent chooses to live in places that are authentic and creative; businesses locate to places in which their employees have access to a rich menu of cultural opportunity; and tourists seek out unique cultural experiences.

Recommended actions are:

- Develop and Implement a Plan for Archaeology
- Develop a joint plan for archaeological resources in Ottawa, in partnership with the NCC, that focuses on resource protection; conservation and management; planning, design and land use, including an update of the 1999 Archaeological Resource Potential Mapping Study; interpretation and public awareness; and hire a full-time, professional municipal archaeologist to spearhead partnered implementation.
- Improve the Preservation of Ottawa's Built and Natural Heritage
- Pro-actively seek designation of heritage buildings and districts under Parts IV and V of the Ontario Heritage Act
- Establish a municipal bylaw that enforces the preservation of heritage buildings and districts
- Provide increased incentives to property owners for the adaptive re-use of historically significant, urban and rural buildings and structures
- Identify, inventory and preserve rural, suburban and urban cultural heritage landscapes in concert with the 2014 Official Plan Review. Cultural heritage landscapes are geographic areas that have been modified, influenced, or given special cultural meaning by people. They provide the contextual and spatial information necessary to preserve and interpret the understanding of important historical settings and changes to past patterns of land use. Examples include a burial ground, historical garden or a larger landscape reflecting human intervention, such as the Rideau Canal, the Rideau and Ottawa Rivers, etc.



The Ontario Archaeological Society Inc.

Kevin Kay, President
 Spike TV
 1633 Broadway
 New York, NY, 10019, USA

RE: American Diggers Series

Dear Mr. Kay

As Director of Heritage Advocacy for the Ontario Archaeological Society (OAS) I wish to express our organization's profound disgust for your series "American Diggers" premiering March 21, 2012.

The OAS is a not-for-profit society founded in 1950 with over 600 members mainly in the province of Ontario but also in Canada and internationally. One of our aims is: "To seek proper means to discourage indiscriminate investigation and digging by untrained or unqualified persons, and thereby advance the ethics of archaeology." (OAS Constitution Article 2-3).

The series documents indiscriminate digging for artifacts by a clearly unqualified "former professional wrestler turned modern day relic hunter". The 'relics' are located and recovered "using state-of-the-art metal detectors and heavy-duty excavation equipment" with no regard for contextual and other evidence destroyed in the process. The artifacts themselves are only regarded as, "waiting to be discovered and turned into profit". Such statements from the program and on your website, repudiate the long-established scientific practice of archaeology, involving the systematic and careful study of all evidence recovered, to understand human lives and lifestyles in the past.

Although the series records the deliberate destruction of American archaeological sites, it will also be shown on Cable TV networks in this country and send the same distorted depiction of archaeology to a large Canadian audience. We shall therefore convey our concerns to cable networks and broadcast regulators in this country.

We strongly urge you not to show the series in its present form but instead, consult professional American archaeology organizations and revise the program content to communicate an ethically recovered, more accurately depicted and even more exciting view of your buried national heritage.

Sincerely,

Morgan J. Tamplin,
 Director of Heritage Advocacy
 Ontario Archaeological Society



The **Ontario
Archaeological
Society** Inc.

PO Box 62066
Victoria Terrace Post Office
Toronto, Ontario M4A 2W1
(416) 406-5959
oasociety@ontarioarchaeology.on.ca
www.ontarioarchaeology.on.ca

Arch Notes submissions

Contributor deadlines:

January 15

March 15

May 15

July 15

September 15

November 15

Send articles to:

aneditor@ontarioarchaeology.on.ca

or

Arch Notes editor

PO Box 62066

Victoria Terrace Post Office

Toronto, Ontario M4A 2W1

Membership

(Canadian \$. Second figure includes a subscription to *Ontario Archaeology*)

| | |
|-------------------------|---------|
| Individual | 36 / 48 |
| Family | 40 / 52 |
| Student | 25 / 34 |
| Institution / Corporate | 62 |
| Life | 800 |

Hamilton

chapter

President: Gary Warrick
Vice President: Jacqueline Fisher
Treasurer: Ruth Macdougall
The Heights Editor: Brad Badow
E-mail: hamiltonOAS@hwn.org
Web: <http://hamilton.ontarioarchaeology.on.ca>
Mail: c/o Dr. Gary Warrick, Laurier Brantford,
73 George St. Brantford, ON N3T 2Y3
Phone: (866) 243-7028
Meetings: 3rd Thursday of the month, Sept. to
May, Fieldcote Museum, 64 Sulphur Springs
Road, Ancaster
Membership: Individual \$11, Family \$18

Hurononia

chapter

President: John Raynor
Secretary: Marg Raynor
Treasurer: Jamie Hunter
The Pot Editor: Bill Gibson
Mail: P.O. is PO Box 638 Midland On L4R 4P4
Meetings: 2nd Thursday of every month Sept. to
May at The Huronia Museum, 549 Little Lake
Park Rd., Midland, ON
Membership: Individual \$15, Family \$18,
Student \$10

London

chapter

President: Nancy VanSas
Vice President: Darcy Fallon
Treasurer: Chris Ellis
Secretary: Chris Dalton
Director: Lindsay Foreman
KEWA Editors: Christine Dodd, Chris Ellis
& Arthur Figura
Web: www.ssc.uwo.ca/assoc/oas
Mail: Museum of Ontario Archaeology, 1600
Attawandaron Rd.,
London, ON N6G 3M6
Phone: (519) 473-1360 Fax (519) 473-1363
Meetings: 8 pm on 2nd Thursday of the month

Ottawa

chapter

President: Glenna Roberts
Vice President: André Miller
Secretary: Libby Imrie
Treasurer: Bill MacLennan
Director of Public Archaeology: Paul Thibaudeau
Director at large: Stacey Girling-Christie &
Karen Lochhead
Ottawa Archaeologist Editor: Marion Clark
Web master: Yvon Riendeau
Web: www.ottawaoas.ca
Email address: contact@ottawaoas.ca
Mail: PO Box 4939, Station E,
Ottawa ON K1S 5J1
Meetings: Every 2nd Thursday of the month
from Sept. to May; usually at Routhier
Community Centre, 172 Guigues Street,
Ottawa (in the Byward Market)
Membership: Individual \$20, Family \$25,
Student \$12

Peterborough

chapter

President: Tom Mohr
Treasurer: Harry Johnson
Vice-President: Bill Fox
Directors: Michael White, Mike Stringer, Julie
Kapryka, Dirk Verhulst
Meetings: the fourth Tuesday of each month,
Location: St. Paul's Church
Membership: Individual \$12, Family \$15,
Student \$8
Strata Editor: Dirk Verhulst
Web: peterborough.ontarioarchaeology.on.ca

Thunder Bay

chapter

President: Clarence Surette
Vice-President: Bill Ross
Secretary/Treasurer: Jennifer Surette
Director: Jill Taylor-Hollings
E-mail: clsurett@lakeheadu.ca
[http://anthropology.lakeheadu.ca/?
display=page&pageid=80](http://anthropology.lakeheadu.ca/?display=page&pageid=80)
Meetings: 7 pm on the last Friday of the month
in Room BB0017, Braun Building, Lakehead
University
Membership: \$5

Toronto

chapter

President: Janice Teichroeb
Past President: Sylvia Teaves
Vice President: Marti Latta
Treasurer: Jane Simser
Secretary: Annie Gould
PROFILE Editor: Amanda Parks
Web: <http://toronto.ontarioarchaeology.on.ca>
Email: TorontoArchaeology@gmail.com
Meetings: 7:30 pm on the 3rd Wednesday
of the month, except June–August
in U of T Anthropology Building,
Room 246, 19 Russell St.
Membership: Individual \$12, Family \$14

Windsor

chapter

President: Katherine Graham
Past President: Rosemarie Denunzio
Secretary: Barbara Johnson
Treasurer: Bob Drago
Web: <http://sites.google.com/site/windsoroas>
Contact: windsoroas@yahoo.ca
Membership: Individual \$15, Family \$20,
Students \$5